


No. 185 MARCH 1984

Spearhead

50p



The Ugly Revolution

HOW OUR LANDSCAPE IS BEING DISFIGURED (SEE ARTICLE PAGES 4 & 5)

Nationalist comment

WHAT WE THINK

on the month's news

The Cheltenham red herring

The Government has not emerged with much credit from the dispute concerning the right of staff at General Communications Headquarters at Cheltenham to belong to a trade union.

In the first place, if the denial by the Government of that right is supposed to be influenced by considerations of national security it is likely to have little effect in that regard. Had the rule existed in the past, it would not have stopped those who have been charged under the Official Secrets Act for various offences in the way of handing information to the nation's enemies; nor will the existence of such a rule in the future stop those who are disposed to do likewise. The most dangerous Communist spies are those who conceal their political affiliations.

Secondly, if the introduction of the rule of non-union membership is right, then it should have been implemented by legislative decree and without the bribe of £1,000 to each GCHQ employee who agrees to observe

it. If we have reached the stage at which we have to offer such inducements to people to fulfil their patriotic duty, then we have reached a low national ebb indeed.

Finally, in so far as the rule is prompted by the intention to avoid GCHQ employees participating in a strike it is quite unnecessary. Police officers have the right to belong to a trade union, the Police Federation, but are still forbidden by the rules of their employ to take strike action. GCHQ employees could have been placed in exactly the same category.

This does not mean that we support the principle of trade union membership for GCHQ workers, only that we believe that the issue is a red herring in present circumstances of industrial relations laws. The conclusion cannot be escaped that here is just another piece of cosmetics introduced by the Government to appease its 'right-wing' supporters at a time when that same Government, on a wide range of other issues, is betraying the pledges it made to those same supporters.

Climb-down over levy

One issue which prior to the last election won Mrs. Thatcher support on the right was the issue of trade union levies payable to the Labour Party. Although the Tories did not in their manifesto make any firm commitment over the matter, they made noises which led to the widespread belief that they would eliminate the present rule whereby all members of unions affiliated to the TUC would have a portion of their dues allocated to Labour Party funds unless they took steps to 'contract out' of this arrangement, and would substitute a new rule whereby the procedure instead would be to 'contract in', i.e. for union members to notify their union that they **did** wish to pay the Labour levy, in default of

which notification it would not be paid.

Such a change of rule is long overdue — and should be welcomed regardless of whether one is an opponent or supporter of Labour. The vast majority of trade union members, like members of the general public, are politically apathetic: they will not stir themselves to register as Labour Party supporters nor will they stir themselves to register as non-supporters of that party; whatever is the present *status quo* they will leave be. This means that if the rule is that their dues will help to finance the Labour Party **unless they protest otherwise** most of those dues will continue to be used for that purpose — a quite monstrous situation.

As we have indicated, the postures adopted by many prominent Tories before the election led to many electors believing that this monstrous rule would be eliminated, and this undoubtedly helped the Tories to garner votes. In fact now the Tories have entirely dropped the idea and instead come to an agreement with the TUC whereby the old rule will remain in force: union dues will continue to be allocated to Labour Party funds unless union members specifically request otherwise. All that the Government has obtained from the TUC is a promise to make information more freely available on this matter to those union members who seek it — a totally meaningless pledge to those who understand the language in which the union bosses speak.

It all amounts to just another climb-down by the Government, another sell-out of the people who elected it.

Buying foreign again

British suppliers of defence equipment have lost an £18 million pound contract to fit anti-Exocet guns to Royal Navy warships and may additionally lose export orders as a result. The contract instead has gone to a Dutch company, the Hollandse Signaal-apparaten, despite the fact that the British model offered was of superior performance, the crucial advantage being that it is reloaded automatically during firing, whereas the Dutch gun empties its magazines within 20 seconds and can take up to 20 minutes to reload. In addition, the British gun, called 'Seaguard', covers the skies from every angle whereas its Dutch rival has certain blind spots above the ship.

Why then has the Ministry of Defence opted, as it so often does, to 'buy foreign'? Apparently the reason is that the agreement to buy the Dutch gun is part of a deal under which the Dutch Navy is to buy Rolls Royce Spey engines to power new ships. This is regarded as essential to help Rolls Royce replenish its flagging order books.

But why indeed are RR order books flagging? One major reason is that the Government has failed to give proper support to the famous engineering firm. One such example has been the policy of allowing British Airways and the British armed forces

SPEARHEAD

No. 185 MARCH 1984

Seacroft, 52 Westbourne Villas, Hove, Sussex

Editor: John Tyndall

Spearhead exists to reflect a cross-section of contemporary British nationalist opinion. It is privately published by its founder and is independent of all political parties and groups.

Unless specifically stated to the contrary, the views expressed in signed articles or letters are the sole responsibility of their authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Editor or the policies of any political organisations *Spearhead* may support editorially.

The appearance of an advertisement in *Spearhead* is not necessarily indicative that the Editor has any knowledge of, interest in or support for the product, service, organisation or function advertised.

Spearhead welcomes enquiries from potential advertisers, to whom rates will be sent on request. Advertising matter, accompanied by pre-payment, must be submitted at least one month prior to the publishing date (normally the first day of each month) of the issue for which the advertisement is intended. The Editor reserves the right to refuse to publish advertisements submitted.

The Editor is pleased to receive from readers manuscripts of articles for possible publication which should normally be not longer than 1,250 words and typed in double-spacing. No payment is made for articles published, which become *Spearhead* copyright unless authors specifically request otherwise at the time they submit their manuscripts. The Editor reserves the right to shorten or otherwise amend articles accepted for publication should shortage of space or editorial judgment require such alteration to be made.

Those wishing to re-print *Spearhead* articles must first gain the permission of the Editor and undertake to include with the re-printed matter the author's name and the name and address of *Spearhead*.

to buy American aircraft instead of British-made products, most of which would have been powered by Rolls Royce engines had they been manufactured.

Procurement of foreign-made defence equipment is currently supported in fashionable circles on the grounds that our forces must obtain the very best products available in the world if they are to function effectively. We believe that this is a short-sighted policy and one which shows that our defence planners fail to see the wood for the trees. Of course when we are concerned with a particular item of defence equipment there is some merit in the argument that the very best should be obtained, even if it has to be bought from abroad. However, every decision concerning specific items should be viewed, not in isolation, but within the context of defence as a whole. One of the most vital of these is a strong, prosperous and thriving national arms industry — without which there can be no national defence at all in any sane meaning of the term. From Britain's point of view this means that we should at all times purchase our needs from British companies, even in cases where there may be some marginal superiority in a foreign product.

In the case of the anti-Exocet gun, however, not even this argument can be put forward in favour of the decision to import from Holland. The decision is a shameful one and should be reversed.

Whiff of sell-out remains

More on the question of talks with Argentina over the Falklands. We are now told that the Government welcomes the latest set of proposals from Buenos Aires because they omit the previous insistence on maintaining the Argentine claim to sovereignty over the Falklands — at least for the time being. Apparently the new Argentine President, Senor Alfonsin, is prepared to exclude this principle from the immediate agenda. Big deal!

We should remain vigilant, however, concerning our own Government's intentions. These were hinted at in a leader in *The Daily Telegraph* on February 1st, which said: "Britain right now is ready to talk about everything except the thing that Mr. Alfonsin wants to talk about (sovereignty). **But with time this may change** . . . Fortress Falklands policy is costing some £600 million a year . . . Britain should make most of the running over improving relations with Argentina but it is still too early to be talking about lease-back, a United Nations presence and sovereignty."

The key words here of course are "too early". These imply obviously that the objection is not to such items appearing on the agenda for talks with Argentina but only to their appearing on that agenda so soon after the cessation of the Falklands War. We have been warned!

We might also take the *Telegraph* up on

Victory in the Falklands. Will the victors be betrayed?



its assertion that Britain should make most of the running over improving relations with Argentina. Why in heaven's name should we? It was Argentina's action in invading the Falklands that caused these relations to deteriorate, and the onus therefore surely lies on Argentina to restore them to the desired level of friendliness — and when on earth in history has it lain with the victorious power in a conflict to "make most of the running" in patching things up afterwards?

As for the expense of Fortress Falklands, we have said it before and we say it again. It is not necessary to the security of the islands that Britain maintain a large military presence there; all that has to be demonstrated is the will of British Government, in the event of a repetition of the 1982 invasion, to exact a terrible penalty on the aggressor. As Napoleon once said: "In war the psychological prevails over the material in a ratio of 10 to 1."

How 'liberal' opinion is made

A story we recently heard from America tells us much about the true foundations of what passes for 'liberal opinion'. J.W. Burke is a writer whose syndicated columns have appeared in several Tennessee newspapers. Recently he wrote a few pieces on the so-called 'Holocaust' in which he commented favourably on Arthur Butz's book, *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, which refutes the allegation that the Nazis deliberately murdered 6 million Jews, and made some other remarks which identified him as sympathetic to the revisionist view of modern history, which challenges the prevailing orthodoxy concerning World War II and some other major events.

In response to these articles the Jews of Jackson, Tennessee, 'summoned' the lead editor who sanctioned their publication. He was made to appear before the entire congregation of Jewry in the town, who terrified him out of his wits by their threats as to what they would do to him and his paper. He was 'ordered' immediately to drop Burke's

column, which he obediently did despite the fact that the column was immensely popular and a major boost to circulation. He gave an undertaking to the Jews never, never to run a newspaper item unfavourable to them ever again or indeed to allow any mention of the 'Holocaust' in terms other than of complete verification. Also he wrote a violent rebuttal of the views of his columnist which descended to downright personal attack.

Quite clearly, if such a rebuttal of Burke and the personal attack on him were genuine reflections of the editor's views, either the writer's comments on the 'Holocaust' would not have been allowed to be printed in the first place or, if they had, they would have been accompanied by a rebuttal at the same time, including, as it should have done, personal condemnation of Burke for thinking such outrageous thoughts. The truth is that the editor had no thought of doing this at the time. Yet under the crack of the Jewish whip he launched into a quite hysterical condemnation of the writer whose views he had only shortly before been quite happy to publish.

Just how much of the agonised 'liberal' wailing on matters of race—particularly when they concern the 'chosen race' is really sincere, really the expression of deeply held convictions, and how much is purely a conditioned response to the brandishing of Jewish power? Most newspaper owners and editors know of this power and the way it can be brought to bear without having to taste a sample of it, as did the editor we have mentioned. Thus we regularly read articles viciously attacking any manifestation of White Anglo-Saxon racial nationalism from the same journalists who will readily defend Jewish racial nationalism of the crudest kind. 'Liberal' opinion on such questions is really just a mirage; it has barely any substance at all but is just the voice of a ventriloquist's dummy uttering the words of his master behind the scenes.

A CASE OF VANDALISM

DAVID BALL looks at the forces destroying our environment and heritage

Over recent years politicians of all parties have suddenly begun to pay attention to the environment. It has become almost a 'trendy' subject to debate and, sadly, concern for our surroundings has more and more been identified as a cause of the 'liberal left'.

The state of our inner cities has been cited as a prime reason for the race riots that have been occurring with increasing frequency over the last few years. To be sure, parts of many of our greatest cities are now in an appalling state, but can this really be blamed as the reason for the clashes between Blacks and police that happen every week? The argument put forward is that if the 'average rioter' were to be placed in a middle-class suburb then all would be well and peace and contentment would reign. This presupposes that environment makes the man rather than the opposite.

Frankly, I believe this is a ridiculous attitude. Where and how we live is a product of man, so to believe that it can suddenly totally affect our lives is preposterous. Of course, if you are placed in dismal surroundings it can be disheartening, but if you do not like the squalor around you then you do the best you can to improve things, rather than sit around moaning. Let us compare, for instance, the fate of nearly identical houses in our cities. In some places you will find well cared for buildings with tidy, well kept gardens, perhaps with only the odd house below par, giving an air of prosperity and brightness to the area; yet but a stone's throw away you can drive past similar properties with peeling paintwork, broken fences and overgrown gardens, with only a few houses in an above-average condition, generating an air of poverty and gloom. It is those who dwell in the houses who have caused these differences.

AFRICAN EXAMPLE

Perhaps the best example of this is beyond our shores, in the continent of Africa. Over many years, the white settlers in the Belgian Congo built substantial dwellings which they equipped with every modern convenience. During the trauma of 'independence' the Whites were forced to flee for their very lives and the natives moved in. Were the Africans immediately transformed into civilised people by their change of abode? Of course not, and soon what had once been

well looked after houses were reduced to nothing better than ramshackle huts.

Thus I do not see the decline of part of the inhabited areas of our cities as a piece of vandalism, but rather the inevitable result of the natural order of life. Given time and effort, I dare say these areas can be improved, but only by changing people's attitudes, not their material circumstances.



VANDALISM IN THE CITY
The new skyline destroys the old

So where is the real destruction of our cities taking place? Consider the true inner city, the business and administrative centres.

The architectural heritage in our best cities is a treasure that has been handed down from our forefathers, and like any heirloom it is something we ought to guard jealously; it is the only physical link we retain between ourselves and previous generations. When you stroll through the historic parts of Britain's towns, deep racial memories are kindled, linking us inexorably with the past and nurturing a feeling of being a part of a greater whole. These buildings are a tangible link in a changing world and we must hand them down to our children and our children's children intact. This is not to say we should never demolish any old buildings, but rather we should be selective about what we decide to knock down, and, just as important, we ought to plan carefully what is to be built in their place as our gift to future generations.

I believe that the buildings we are currently erecting in our cities are seriously wrong in three very important respects. Firstly, many are not necessary in that far too many buildings are being levelled in the name of 'progress'. Buildings that are not only pleasing to the eye but also structurally intact are being destroyed every day, thus breaking the bond with our forefathers. We are assured that all the new building erected are necessary, but judging by the number of empty office blocks scattered throughout our cities, this is obviously absurd. So it has to be a miscalculation on the part of the developers ... or is there, deep down, a more sinister motive?

Secondly, the buildings that are being erected in place of those so callously demolished are, frankly, ugly. I once saw a programme on television which examined modern art in its various forms, called *Shock of the New*. I couldn't have put it better, for the modern monstrosities that pose as buildings are stark, angular and generally a shock to the senses. All you can see in many of our city centres these days are huge structures of glass, iron and concrete that are an unsightly blight on the landscape. Previously, our architecture could trace a long path of evolution winding back through the centuries, ending in the nursery of Western civilisation, Ancient Greece. These new additions to our landscape break that chain abruptly, and perhaps we ought to ask ourselves whether this break with our architectural heritage is an accident or do they serve a conscious purpose?

Finally, I object most strongly to those who are building these monstrosities; virtually every major building erected is a monument to big business. The buildings are not identified as being part of our heritage by the ordinary person and they are not something to be proud of, for they do not belong to us, but are rather the visible signs of an occupying power.

NATIONAL TREASURES

The greatest buildings within our towns and cities ought to be nationally-owned properties, majestic in their splendour. They should totally overshadow the buildings that private institutions need to erect, so that the very heart of our cities become a visible

Contd. on next page

tribute to the greatness of the British Nation. Give the people a core to be proud of, one that takes the breath away, and then perhaps they too may start to take a pride in their home environment, something no amount of money poured into those squalid areas can do. Given the state of our major cities, we have a lot of redevelopment to do!

A rather interesting aside at this point turns back to the Second World War. During this period, grand and noble cities across all of Europe were devastated by aerial bombardment, destroying forever the labour of centuries. It is interesting to note who espoused this policy of architectural destruction the most enthusiastically. It was the forces of 'Freedom and Democracy' that brought the centres of cities into the battle-zone. Perhaps, then, the almost complete destruction of Dresden, formerly one of Germany's most beautiful cities, contained a deeper motive than we may have previously thought. It may sound, on the face of it, a preposterous suggestion, but perhaps this architectural terrorism was something that was understood all too well by those who ruled us.

Now I shall turn the spotlight away from the urban areas, and instead focus it on rural Britain. In passing, it is worthy of note that the smaller market towns, the importance of which for country folk is often not understood by city dwellers, are suffering many of the problems that predominate in our large conurbations, in that big supermarkets and office blocks are more and more dominating the environment, thus overwhelming the unobtrusive charm of these quiet places.

ASSAULT UPON NATURE

However, I do not wish at this time to consider the fate of civilisation in the country, but rather the assault upon nature itself. One problem the countryside shares with the cities is the way large roads have been driven through it with all the subtlety of a bull in a china shop. In the name of progress, huge six-lane motorways have cut a route through tranquil valleys, smashed a way through long-established woods and ruined millions of acres of fertile farmland. Ah, but think of the benefits by the way of quick and easy communications, you may well say. But is it worth it? Was it all necessary? Did we need the roads? If you want a society where all own motor cars that pollute the atmosphere and so cram our roads that motoring is no longer a pleasure, then the answer is yes. However, think of the many millions of pounds that have been spent on these vast scars across our once

green and pleasant land, and then imagine if they had instead been spent on modernising our once massive railway network. Surely in this crowded land of ours we cannot afford the ecological effects of mass car ownership? A large and well-maintained public transport network has to be a real alternative.

Now let us consider the effects of modern agricultural methods. More and more of our countryside is being turned into a huge factory whose sole function is to turn out ever increasing quantities of food. Granted, we do need to feed ourselves, but must we sacrifice the countryside to do so? Countless hedgerows have been ripped up during the last thirty years in order to establish large and 'efficient' fields. Vast quantities of fertilisers, pesticides and weedkillers are poured onto the land every year, often killing large numbers of wild animals. Nature is very rough and ready and she cannot be made to bow to the ways of man easily, and if perchance you do manage in some respect to tame her, then there is often a price to pay. The price we are now paying for intensive farming is the steady reduction of the numbers of certain wild animals in our countryside.

TREE FACTORIES

Similarly, such 'businesslike' methods have been adopted in our forests, if they now can be called this. As trees are cut down, more are planted to replace them, but now the choice of a replacement is often made on the grounds of speedy growth, thus allowing quick harvest, and so many of our wooded areas are becoming huge open-air tree factories, with all the effects on wildlife you can imagine.

Now at this point I run the risk of being accused of trying to increase Britain's dependence on foreign imports of food and other natural resources by advocating a less intensive means of reaping nature's harvest. True, but there again I would never have thrown away a huge empire that could have fed us and kept us well supplied with other raw materials, whilst we fulfilled their needs

in the way of manufactured goods. Those in power knew all the effects of destroying what was once the mightiest empire the world had ever seen, and from their viewpoint the turning of our countryside into a regimented food factory was probably an integral part of their plan to reduce us all to totally controlled 'androids'.

NEED FOR RECOLONISATION

If I may be permitted to pose an obtuse question: is the Empire gone forever? This may seem absurd to many, but just consider the state of affairs in Africa, the dark continent that grows daily darker. The nations built by White settlers are now gradually breaking down, and indeed in several cases only the countryside immediately about the capital cities can be regarded as national territory (for example, Uganda and Angola). One day the need of the rest of the world for Africa's resources will force us to go back in, or die. Of course, this state of affairs is still far off, but who is to say what might one day happen? I suspect that the Soviet Union would be more than happy to be granted what is sometimes called 'a piece of the action'. Several parts of Africa are their *de facto* colonies already, and I am sure some kind of tacit agreement could be reached with them. After all, the Soviets are above all practical politicians, and their public stands on international 'morality' and their actual practical attitude are totally different. Is this all just a flight of fantasy? Stranger things have happened.

To summarise, we are the passing guardians of our country, and the onus is on us to protect and cherish it for those who will follow us. If we squander its treasures, or allow them to be taken from us, then we will be party to the destruction of a heritage that has been built up over thousands of years. But do the British people currently have any real power to affect the way their past is being mauled? I fear not, for, as I said earlier, the attack on our physical heritage is but one part of the plan to subjugate us into the morass of one-world slavery.

APPEAL FOR EXTRA HELP

SPEARHEAD has just lost a battle with the Inspector of Taxes which we thought confidently it would win. This has been over a sum of money the Inspector claimed we owed him amounting to £171.60. We have to pay the sum this month.

The amount in question is not huge, but it is sufficient to upset the calculations for solvency which we had made following the response to our fund appeal made last October and to which readers generously contributed.

We now, regretfully, have to make an extra appeal to readers to send in contributions to help us raise this sum payable to the Inland Revenue. We sincerely hope that everyone will respond as they have done in the past. Please address your cheques to Spearhead and send them to 52 Westbourne Villas, Hove, Sussex.

Britain needs a folk community

DAVID MYATT looks at the causes of national division

That something is fundamentally wrong with our country is obvious. Nearly every week one reads or hears of another old person, often infirm, savagely beaten by young thugs. Serious crime continues to rise; perhaps another policeman has been shot in the back in Ulster, or another youth has died clutching his tube of glue the list of social and moral decay is very long.

Some people, notably socialists and 'liberals', consider all these and their many kindred problems as products of economic conditions—if more money is spent, they argue, to provide more facilities, more opportunities, more education and so on, social problems will decline. To them, a powerful State, imbued with socialist or Marxist ideas is the cure for most, if not all, these ills.

Others, mostly 'conservatives' and traditionalists, believe that such problems require only authority and control—more police, more laws governing human behaviour (like 'glue-sniffing'), more parental control. Some of these people may even be aware of the racial element in problems like mugging, but their solution would never be segregation of the races, and certainly not repatriation. Rather, it would be more 'education' or laws (for Whites only, of course) to make us more aware of the need for a peaceful, multi-racial society.

Yet what all these solutions and ideas do—be they conservative, 'liberal', socialist or whatever—is treat the symptoms, not the underlying cause. All these people accept society today as it has evolved, and all seek to change that society to accord with a certain abstract ideal—be that ideal free-enterprise capitalism, socialism or whatever. In all this, they are concerned not with people but with ideas: the idea of racial equality, for example, or the idea of sexual equality; the idea of free-market forces and so on. What these people have forgotten in their pursuit of theories and politics is the folk.



MERRY ENGLAND IN ELIZABETHAN DAYS
Maypole dancing, seen here, was a typical folk tradition. Then this country had a true sense of community rooted in common racial origin.

Every state and every nation is, in its origins (unless it is a creation like some of today's artificial 'nations') a **folk community**—that is, a community of people of common race, with common customs and beliefs. What gives this community its units is primarily

its racial coherence. Britain, for instance, owes its origin as a nation to the racial coherence of its tribes; from Celts, Saxons, Vikings, Danes, Angles to Normans—all are Northern European in race. All shared

Contd. on next page

common traditions and myths, and often a common language—even today it is still possible, for example, for a Scandinavian to understand parts of Yorkshire or Northumberland dialect. This racial kinship made Britain as a nation possible; institutions like those of the law, were only possible because the folk community shared a common inheritance and possessed the same aspirations and desires. Justice meant the same for Angles, Danes, Vikings and Saxons—it was an extension of how they felt about the world and the people in it. And nowhere is this better illustrated than in the story and myth of Robin Hood.

Robin Hood is, in a sense, the embodiment of the spirit of the folk community: forthright, courageous, loyal, daring and possessed of that nobility which is the hallmark of the North European. Not for him a cowardly attack on old women; certainly not treachery and dishonour. And, most telling of all, he represents that essential quality of fair play that has been associated with the British for generations and which was, above everything else, the quality which ruled the Empire.

Yet Robin Hood is a folk hero, not just because of these qualities, but because he was concerned first and foremost with his own local community. He strove and fought not for some abstract political idea, nor even for foreign conquest, but for the people amongst whom he lived. He was not concerned about crusades, national or international but **about people whom he knew**. Being of the same race as them—and thus sharing with them a common inheritance—he was a man of his own people: far more so than, for example, Thomas More who suffered and died for some abstract idea.

In the society of the time, the King of England was still a leader of men who fought his own battles and proved by his courage and success that he was worthy of leadership. Men and communities were fiercely independent and justice was still a personal justice, based on a code of honour. Injustice was often present—but a man had only to be bold and fight for himself and his family to be free. It was the individual who counted, not some authority far away.

Over the centuries government continued to grow—the King and his Court became remote from the people. By the time of Henry VIII the King was no longer expected to prove his valour in battle—he was leader by law, according to some abstract idea called 'Divine Right'. Britain became less and less a nation of communities co-operating in self-reliance, but increasingly a hierarchial society where government was imposed and exercised for personal whim or 'idealistic' causes. In short, the government ceased to

be a folkish government concerned first and foremost with the folk.

This remoteness of government and legislature, which really started with Edward the First's statute *Quia Emptores*, led to the absurdity that is with us today—government by parliamentarianism. The revolt of 1381 showed what was to come—the rights of individuals (free peasants, small burgesses and such like) were ignored on the pretext of 'public (that is, government) interest'. Feudal oaths had given way to government decree.

THE MODERN POLITICIAN

This government was (and still is) conducted by the few for the benefit of a few at the expense of the many. The 'politician' is, by the very nature of his calling, everything our ancestors despised: full of self-importance, opinionated, deceitful and cowardly. Not for the vast majority of politicians the forthright honesty of country folk—and it is no coincidence that the growth of parliamentary government coincided with the growth of cities; the 'politician' is a city creature, rootless and owing allegiance only to himself and his ideas or those of his 'party'.

As government grew remote, so the folk community (best illustrated by the medieval village) ceased to belong to the folk—it was controlled, changed, often totally destroyed. With industrialisation, cities, and thus central government, grew in importance, and the folk became fodder for the new ideas of industrial greed and finance capitalism.

With the First World War, the folk communities of Britain that remained—with their self-reliance, their local pride and their forthrightness—were nearly destroyed because a government decided we must fight our racial kin, the Germans, for reasons more to do with finance capitalism than anything else. To this end they persuaded the folk by indoctrinating them with lies about German wickedness and the German desire to rule the world. This war, unlike that with Napoleon who might have invaded Britain, was senseless and tragic, and made it all the easier for a decimated nation to be dominated by false ideas and values. The materialism of the consumer society had begun.

After the First World War society as we know it today developed: local self-sufficiency in food, for example, based on folk communities, gave way to a system planned and dictated by central government. The power of the shires was diminished, and while local pride remained strong among the people, the rapid development of transportation and communication broke down local barriers. This process was, above all, helped

by the dissemination of rootless ideas spawned in the cities. Of these new ideas perhaps Socialism was the most insidious. This, coupled with the exploitation that inevitably accompanied the growth of finance capitalism, with its disposable consumerism for the sake of profits, rapidly destroyed communities. People became objects on a planner's board, the objects of commercial propaganda—but above all fodder for every 'new' idea or style of life.

Today, Britain is not a true folk community. It is a collection of different cultures and sub-cultures all of whom just happen to inhabit the same island. No common folk tradition binds this collection—indeed, there is no longer a common folk but instead a mixture of races. This collection is governed by an increasingly remote collection of rootless people who owe their allegiance not to their own people and their aspirations but to alien interests and ideas. Politicians talk of themselves not as British, certainly not as Anglo-Saxon, but only of being 'socialist' or 'liberal' or whatever. Increasingly, this remote government is becoming controlled by a still more remote one in Europe which is destroying what few traditions and identity we still possess in the name of 'harmonisation'.

RACIAL BOND

Britain was once a land of folk communities—in towns as well as in the country. What made these communities was the common factor of race—what held them together above and beyond this racial factor was not only adversity (in living conditions, as for example in the fishing villages or some of the mining towns) but a shared set of values. These values, which included honesty to one's kind, thrift and a stubborn personal pride, were once common to most of our race and made for a settled society as a whole. A sense of belonging existed—not primarily to the nation, but to a community. One was proud to be from a particular village or even a particular street, and this pride and sense of belonging was only possible as long as the communities were racially the same. Thus, for example, I can remember as a lad growing up in a small mining district in a small house whose only entrance was into a yard shared with several other houses. Everybody knew everybody else; most of the men worked down the pits and there was a sense of belonging. During the day (and often the night) the house would be left unlocked; no one minded the tin bath by the fire, or the tiny rooms. But all the houses were knocked down to make way for a wider road, the small community was dispersed and re-

Contd. on page 11

LAW AS THE SERVANT OF POLITICS

LAW is generally perceived as a body of rules by which a society lives and which is enforceable by that society in the interests of the common good. The more complex the society the more complex will be the laws pertaining to it, but all laws should be based upon the concept of methodical, systematic order and equality before the Law. The concept of right, within our present legal system, is only enforceable to the extent to which it conforms to established legal precepts and such virtues as morality, decency and good manners, even though socially desirable, are not regarded as matters for legal compulsion. It has been said that laws should correspond with the feelings of right and wrong which exist within a society, thus ensuring that the Law will be acceptable to the majority and therefore enforceable.

A study by STANLEY CLAYTON-GARNETT

It is important, in our present democratic society, to note the difference between Law and Justice in that Law is defined as being predictable whereas Justice is uncertain and often subjective. My intention in this article is to demonstrate how this conventional conception of the function of Law entrenches and reinforces the anti-social components within our society and emphasises that which is negative and stultifying rather than the positive and dynamic elements necessary for our national regeneration.

The United Kingdom is a unitary state with an unwritten constitution whose legal system is based upon common law in England, Wales and Northern Ireland and upon Roman Law in Scotland, supplemented by statutes enacted by Parliament. The constitution consists of a body of conventions and written parliamentary statutes which are not codified in a single enacted document such as exists in other Western countries, and because it is "unwritten" it has the advantage of being "flexible". In addition to the conventional and statutory elements of the Law, there is judge-made law, or to put it more delicately, "case law", which permits judges the right to declare the law upon the basis of previous judicial decisions, and there is also "Equity", or the pursuit of "fairness", which falls within the jurisdiction of the Court of Chancery.

The virtues of the British Constitution have been extolled by international jurists, Establishment

politicians and black "political bwanas" of now "independent" ex-colonial territories, who usually sing its praises whilst weeping into their begging bowls, but none has waxed more fulsomely upon the subject than former Prime Minister, William Pitt, when addressing the House of Commons on March 1st, 1784. He said:

"The Constitution of this country is its glory; but in what a nice adjustment does its excellence consist! Equally free from the distraction of democracy and the tyranny of monarchy, its happiness is to be found in its mixture of parts. It was this mixed government which the prudence of our ancestors devised and which it will be our wisdom to support. They extracted a system which has been the envy and admiration of the world. It is this scheme of government which constitutes the pride of Englishmen and which they can never relinquish but with their lives."

Let us examine more closely this source of "envy and admiration" and see how it has stratified society, extended privilege and hindered the forces of national renewal by its Establishment orientation.

MONEY BUYS JUSTICE

The Law in Britain exists for the preservation of the *status quo* and is the created instrument of the landed and the wealthy, and, in consequence, access to the courts is governed by one's ability to pay. Modern social legislation such as the Legal Aid Act, 1949, provided limited legal aid for those with very low incomes and improvements in the scheme were effected by the Acts of 1974 and 1979. The provision, however, is still limited to those with a disposable income of £4,075 per annum and a contribution to costs is exacted from those with a disposable income above £1,700. In addition to the indicated contribution to the Legal Aid Fund, an unsuccessful litigant is also liable to pay the other side's costs and, even if successful, he is liable to pay a contribution from the money or goods recovered. It is not possible to obtain legal aid for defamation suits, undefended matrimonial proceedings, appearances before tribunals or arbitration proceedings.

To defend your honour in court as an individual or a member of a minority political party, you must be in a position to lubricate the

wheels of Justice with money. Equal before the Law? What an Establishment fabrication! One must suffer defamation, malignment and character assassination unless one has the means to proceed to the High Court, resist several appeals and be prepared to succumb to the plunder of the legal profession. Those with influence who malign a minority political party or one of its members can confidently take the risk of not being made accountable because of the monumental financial barriers placed in the paths of most plaintiffs.

We live in a country where most of the abstract virtues carry a price-tag and honour is no exception. The old cliché that "a man without honour is nothing" may have little weight in contemporary society and yet, to a Nationalist, "honour" is the summary of everything in which he believes. Destroy a man's honour and deprive him of the means of reinstatement is the old Establishment ploy which has been used effectively from the posthumous indictment of Richard III to the legal travesty of the Nuremburg Tribunal. If you take away a man's honour you can heap all calumnies upon his head, as in the case of Rudolf Hess, even to the extent of life-imprisonment, with the aid of the contrived fabrications of an international conspiracy.

The legal fabricationists have sought to deprive Richard III, Rudolf Hess and the other Nuremburg victims of their honour, yet they have failed miserably to destroy their credibility and dignity. If the Law corresponds with the feelings, sentiments and perceptions of right and wrong within a society, then what sort of Law do we have in a society which is decadent, corrupt and rank with immorality? Should not the legal system reflect that which is most sacred to a Nation and should it not be the repository of the Nation's heritage, honour and destiny?

In a Nationalist state, Law, Education and Information would form a triad which would forge the National identity. Freedom there would be: the freedom to lead a satisfying cultural life; the freedom to serve and create; the freedom for personal development and, as a consequence, to enhance one's own ability to contribute to the well-being of the State and Nation; but not the freedom to foment, to disrupt, to impair or to degrade. Nationalist Law would seek the moral enhancement of the human condition and, rather than that Law would reflect the condition of society, society would reflect the purifying force of objective Law as a redemptive impulse in the creation of the selfless, elevating objectivity of the Folk State.

CHANGES NEEDED

In our constitution we should retain the conventions and customs which are the reposed wisdom of our Nordic common law, but we should expunge those statutes which perpetuate undeserved privilege or threaten our racial integrity, e.g. the Race Relations Acts of 1965, 1968 and 1976; the Abortion Act of 1967; the Abolition of the Death Penalty Act of 1965 and all acts which legalise homosexuality, perversion or personal corruption. There will be, of course, other legislation which

Contd. on page 20

PATRIOTISM IN DISARRAY

The Hon. O.G. ALLANSON-WINN analyses how false history has distorted a once noble word

In the short preface to his extremely interesting book *Britain's Blunder*, Peter Nicoll wrote these words: "He (the author) has been actuated by no other motive than the desire to make truth and sanity and charity prevail over the fevered passions of false patriotism, violent antipathies and bigoted ignorance."

I would like to suggest that 'bigoted ignorance' leads to 'violent antipathies' which in turn can lead to 'false patriotism'. We must ask: how is the bigoted ignorance generated? The answer is, through the information media which, over the last eighty years, have been largely in the hands of an *elite* power of money whose objective is world domination.

I believe there is much muddled thinking about the meaning of the words 'patriot' and 'patriotism' and practically no thinking about their misuse. **A patriot is one motivated by duty and loyalty to his fatherland and heritage.**

An interesting exercise is the search for individual true patriots who played leading roles in World War II, and two immediately come to my mind: one is Vidkun Quisling, whose name has been accepted by the compilers of dictionaries as synonymous to 'traitor'; another is Marshal Petain, the hero of Verdun. But I must also mention, with some trepidation, William Joyce (Lord Haw Haw).

Ralph Hewins has much to tell us about Quisling in his book *Quisling, Prophet Without Honour*, and Sisley Huddleston's *France, the Tragic Years* is at least as revealing in its treatment of Petain. Another name, as difficult to incriminate as both of these, is Rudolf Hess.

What price did these men pay for their patriotism?

I am waiting anxiously for the revisionists to give the true image of Quisling, who was judicially murdered as soon as possible after the termination of hostilities; he had too much to reveal! Petain, taken out of retirement to advise on the retreat of the disintegrated French army corps and blamed for the inevitable surrender, was incarcerated until death; why? one might ask; he had too much to reveal!

William Joyce, admittedly a difficult character, had been a front line supporter of the British Union of Fascists; rather than spend the war years in Brixton Prison with Mosley, Captain Ramsay, Admiral Domville, and many other patriots, he decided to carry

on the battle against the money powers from Germany. He also was judicially murdered for his actions. His *Twilight Over England*, written in 1941, makes most interesting reading because he forecast Britain's future decline as accurately as did Rudolf Hess.

Hess was a man of great courage and integrity who flew to Britain not as representing a victorious Germany but as a supplicant asking for a negotiated peace on equal terms with Britain; but this could not be permitted because the covert objective of the war had not been completed—the destruction of a national system of government free from the claws of usurious internationalism which held, and still holds, Britain in its satanic grasp.

There are two fascinating books by truly patriotic inmates of Brixton Prison, incarcerated under section 18b of the Defence of the Realm Act during World War II: *The Nameless War*, by Captain Archibald and *Admiral to Cabin Boy*, by Admiral Sir Barry Domville, an amusing account of the author's experiences which caused his detention. I am purposely only briefly including in this scrappy survey of patriotic actors in the World War II drama the names of Hitler and Mussolini—not so much for the fact that the

armour of prejudice is too case-hardened for the penetration of truth but because the revisionists of the history of those years have been busy on the job for some time now; all I have to suggest is that the patriotism of these men sealed their doom. It is remarkable, however, that neither lived to write his memoirs; they had too much to tell, as in the case of Quisling and Goering, whose *Last Letter*, addressed to Winston Churchill, is very revealing, as is also his *Germany Reborn*.

DECANONISING CHURCHILL

When we attempt to remove the stuffing from the images of the accepted 'patriots' of World War II, the first must be that of Winston Churchill, whom Domville describes in his little book as 'a national calamity'. Captain Ramsay has much more to tell us of Churchill's pre-war contacts with Roosevelt. It should also be remembered that Churchill's possibly closest friend was Bernard Baruch, who boasted of being the most influential individual of the period. If one is sufficiently interested in having a peep at the stuffing of the Churchill image, General J.C.F. Fuller has much to tell of that hero's 'patriotism' in his

Contd. overleaf



HOMAGE TO MARSHAL PETAIN

Commanders of all nations in World War I salute the hero of Verdun.

Later he was branded as a 'traitor'.

PATRIOTISM IN DISARRAY

(Contd. from prev. page)

book *Conduct of War*, which is necessary reading because it was written by a highly esteemed military historian.

'DEFENDER OF DEMOCRACY'

Churchill was, of course, the great 'defender of Democracy', and it is interesting to remember that Hitler wrote that 'Democracy' would be the vehicle that minority power would use to control all peoples.

Churchill's war was virtually a confrontation with a far greater leader than he, whose success as a true patriot was more than he could leave unchallenged; Churchill unfortunately suffered from two very human failings: insufferable conceit and excessive ambition, which exposed him to the machinations of the experts of flattery and blandishment—agents of the money power.

What was Hitler's image like before World War II? Of the many men of intelligence and understanding of European politics in the thirties I will quote only one, Lloyd George:—

"A change in Germany's monetary system caused her to turn from abysmal depression to a glorious economic boom. There is no doubt that Hitler, as far as Germany is concerned, is the resurrection and the life. He is the saviour of Germany, a great and wonderful leader. He is the George Washington of Germany, the greatest statesman living, and the German people are the happiest on earth."

The most important words in the above quotation are the first six, and it was the success of that change which made war a certainty.

My first introduction to Hitler's proposals regarding Danzig and access across the 'corridor' I found in a most interesting book *The Suicide of Europe*, by Prince Michel Sturdza, a Rumanian soldier and diplomat. These proposals were remarkable for their moderation and intelligent approach to a situation which, whatever the 'court historians' may have told us, was necessary and considered just in the beliefs of most knowledgeable, influential men in Britain at the time.

Who were the false patriots in Britain who told Poland that Germany was only bluffing and that Beck should not even consider those proposals? Those men knew Hitler was not bluffing. They also knew that a Polish refusal would mean war.

Compare Lloyd George's opinion of Hitler with this, coming from a very senior chief justice when I asked him what he and

his peers thought of Churchill: "An ambitious opportunist".

I am prepared to be criticised for the above observations; but I offer no apology because in our search for that elusive little grail, Truth, we have to look further than the works of the 'Court' historians, as one might term the prosecution, who have free access to the court and jury; we have to search for defence counsels whom the media deny access to the people, the jury.

Churchill and such historians as William Shirer enjoyed the maximum of expression, but can we say the same of Hitler, Mussolini, Quisling and Goering? They had no chance to write their memoirs and history of those tragic years.



CHURCHILL

Was he the 'patriot' he was made out to be?

Surely this contention is evident in Britain today; she is permanently bankrupt, deprived of her colonial interests and subjected to alien-controlled media. It is time for the true patriots to stand and be counted, but usury has strange bedfellows, always prepared to raise the flag, as in World War II, to destroy such countries as Germany and Italy, which had developed satisfactory economies which threatened International Finance.

As I have mentioned Prince Sturdza's book and as our subject is patriotism, I should mention that he introduces his readers to a truly great Rumanian patriot, Codreanu, whose name is hardly known in Britain but

whose dedication to his country's interests must be a lesson to any true patriot. Yes, Prince Sturdza has much to tell his readers. Codreanu was murdered in police custody—yet another great man who had no chance to write post-war memoirs which would have helped the 'council for the defence'.

REVISIONIST MOVEMENT

During the last four or five years what I term the 'council for the defence' is slowly reaching the jury, the people, although fearfully ignored by the 'bench'. An important part of this work is being done by the Institute for Historical Review, PO Box 1306, Torrance CA 9050, USA, through the untiring efforts of a few qualified revisionists who are removing the stuffing from the 'wicked' German image so that Peter Nicoll's "truth and sanity and charity may prevail".

I have been straying from my subject of false patriotism, but I would ask my readers to study Peter Nicoll's words, which will return me to my objective: to expose 'bigoted ignorance'. Can we excuse a British leader because his actions were motivated by ignorance? The answer is, of course, no. So the ectomy on the Churchill image removes any doubt of his being conscious of his actions; whatever virus infected the 'stuffing', though not 'bigoted ignorance', must have caused a 'fevered passion' of 'false patriotism'. I am not suggesting that he did not intend true patriotism but I am suggesting that his actions were greatly influenced by his close friend, Bernard Baruch, and others in the USA who represented the money power elite, of whom Roosevelt seems to have been a willing pawn.

The truth is the British people have lost their way; for many years they have been led to strange courses uncharted by their representatives, most of whom are motivated by purely egoistical considerations. No strong leader has emerged to call the country to arms against 'the enemy within'.

As there is now no 'wicked German' to identify as the enemy, no Nazi, no Fascist, the Anglo-Saxon should surely look for destructive elements 'within'. We do not have to look far because our people mostly spend hours watching television, and I am not alone in my contention that this is an instrument far more destructive than anything the physicists have devised. It is the tool of the psycho-politicians with a diabolical subliminal influence on the young, especially designed for moral degeneration; this alien-controlled medium is surely an extension of what Francis Parker Yockey termed "the ethical syphilis of Hollywood".

Contd. on next page

I must express my views on the stuffing of the Mussolini image. No false patriotism here, no virus infestation of money or personal gain. Mussolini was in one respect luckier than Hitler because his country had not been beaten to the canvas during World War I, so the Communists were not so well organised; he simply chased them from the cellars in 1919 and set up a government based on the state and economy being the servants of the people; a type of Guild system proved beneficial to both employer and employee, and the country owned its own money.

QUISLING CASE

I will briefly touch on the case of Vidkun Quisling because the little known books: *Quisling, Prophet Without Honour* and *I Was Quisling's Secretary*, by Knudsen, have stories of this true patriot very different from the image revoltingly fashioned by the 'Court' historians. Hewin's book is essential reading for anybody who may be puzzled by the destruction of this remarkable Norwegian patriot, who was in fact anti-Communist but, like Petain, probably Fascist.

That the British people are willing to permit the perpetuation from the presses and on the screens of such proven fantasies as *Holocaust* and *Genocide* is surely a measure of the same gullibility which permitted them to have been tricked into two devastating wars.

I can recommend a salutary exercise for any Briton to whom the 'wickedness' of the Germans seemed the ultimate: a book by F.J.P. Veale, *Advance to Barbarism*, which is supported with forewords by the late Very Rev. W.R. Inge and Lord Hankey. This book exposes war crimes committed by the Allies at least as diabolical as any attributed to Germany.

It may seem presumptive of me to suggest that the Anglo-Saxons are now paying the retribution which should be the burden of their leaders during the last seventy or more years, but there is no doubt that they may look in vain for true friends in the Western world. Nemesis, through a determined lady, may not choose a people's leaders.

We do not have to search far for the mind which conceived the true holocausts of World War II. The Lindemann plan, which was adopted by Churchill and, one supposes, agreed by his war cabinet, aimed at the destruction of not just the industries and communications of war in Germany but the closer settlements, where the workers lived; this disgraceful plan is termed in *Bombing Vindicated*, by P. Spreight, as a 'splendid decision'. The final evidence of such

splendour was the bombing of Dresden in February 1945, when there was no chance of the Allies losing the war. In a brilliantly organised operation, at least 135,000 defenceless people were burned to death in the record time of thirty-six hours, a 'splendid' operation carried out by truly patriotic young Britons on the instructions of 'false patriots' obeying the orders of those whose financial world empire Hitler's Germany had challenged and threatened to end.

The time is long overdue for true Britishers to demand a White Paper exposing the damnable lies about 'gas-chambers' and 'genocide' of which Hitler's Germany is accused. But—and here we come to the crux of the issue—who has the courage to expose these lies?

BREACHING PREJUDICE

I believe the time is long overdue for the formation of an International German Defence League, the chief objective being to effect a breach in the case-hardened prejudice which has been created and perpetuated through the last seventy years by the hate merchants. Two interesting works in this respect are *Unconditional Hatred*, by Capt. Russell-Grenfell, and *Dealing in Hate*, by Dr. Connors.

It must surely be agreed by all civilised persons of whatever race or creed that in a court of law the Counsel for Defence should have equal access to the Bench and Jury (the people) as the Prosecution, if Justice is to be done.

The Bench is deteriorating but we, the Jury, must support the truth and ignore the cries of 'Nazi', 'Fascist' and 'Anti-Semite'.

BRITAIN NEEDS A FOLK COMMUNITY (Contd. from page 7)

housed. The houses they moved to were bigger—but no one left them unlocked.

Today, the 'community' is created by planning—and the racial bond is gone. With no heritage to be proud of, with no community pride, with no connection at all between himself and the soil which nourishes him and gives him life, and with no understanding of the adversity of toil which our ancestors knew, the city dweller and the resident of the town is prey to the rootless poison that seeps from television, books, newspapers and the cinema. With no real sense of identity, his mind polluted by propaganda encouraging race-mixing and which denigrates everything noble, this modern denizen of the increasingly cosmopolitan

Justice in respect of the actions of many of those individuals who played leading roles during those tragic years of two wars has not been seen to have been done; truth, without which justice cannot exist, has been smothered by a mantle of lies and deceptions.

So now the Anglo-Saxon is faced with an enemy much more dangerous and subtle than foreign armies, a destroyer supported by unlimited funds and possessing satanic intelligence, 'the enemy within'.

The British people may wait in vain for a leader to emerge from the ranks of their presently elected 'representatives' because financed Democracy always creates a party caucus which is hopelessly vulnerable to the influences of the lobbyists of the 'enemy within'.

Never before in the history of the Anglo-Saxon has it been so necessary to call true patriots to the colours in defence of their countries and heritage and probably never before is less being done in this respect by the elected 'representatives' of the people. Similarly, probably never before has 'false patriotism' caused greater destruction of our countries and heritage, the same 'false patriotism' which was so successful in destroying the efforts of our German cousins to throw off the tentacles of the same finance internationalism which holds Great Britain in its monstrous grasp.

Britain can be saved only by men and women who understand the power of unity. Men of strong character must be able to discard peripheral issues of disagreement; the vortex has a centre and it is from this centre that the whirlwind is activated, and always we must remember Bryant's admonition: "Not yet, O Freedom! close the lids in slumber, for thine enemy never sleeps."

megalopolis is an easy victim for those seeking to destroy race and nation as a prelude to Marxism as well as those seeking a quick profit whatever the cost.

Given this destruction of our folk it should be no surprise to find our society in decay. Only by returning to folk communities can we cure this decay. But to achieve that, we will first have to make our land once again a country of North European stock.

The chaos and decadence of today's racially mixed society can lead in the long term to only one thing: the controlled society of communism. A folk so divided as ours, so rootless and prey to abstract and artificial ideas, so cut off from its racial instincts, is ready to fall. The communists, with their terror to make one conform, are waiting. Already with our controlled and planned society we are half-way to Marxism. Before too long the change will be irreversible.

MORE ABOUT THAT PANORAMA PROGRAMME

Someone once said that when a man writes a book he unwittingly reveals as much about himself as about his characters. A similar thing can be said about the television people connected with *Panorama* and their programmes. The recent programme, for instance, about the Conservative Party and its alleged infiltration by so-called right-wing extremists' revealed just as much about the prejudices, bias and opinions of the *Panorama* team as it did about its subject. It was one of those programmes where that repellent figure, the investigative journalist, took the main part.

The programme began with a short interview with a Conservative candidate standing in a local election who professed a great interest in and admiration for Adolf Hitler. I thought this was going to set the trend for the whole programme, but no—we never saw nor heard from him again, so I wondered why he was ever produced. I suppose *Panorama* wanted to give the impression that he was by no means untypical of Conservative candidates. We were never told, incidentally, whether he was ever elected.

The whole programme was intended to show what a fearful beast a racist was and that the Conservative Party was in danger of being taken over by these frightful creatures. Of course, anyone with the smallest knowledge of the present day Tory Party will know that there is not the slightest chance of this—more's the pity. Most members of the party, particularly the leading lights, would be terrified of being accused of racism. What always makes me furious about such programmes is the implied idea running all through them that nobody, except for a tiny minority of 'extremists', could possibly hold any different opinions on race and multi-racialism from those held by the *Panorama* team and similar bodies. This view runs throughout official Britain.

Programmes about so-called 'racists' also seem to have extended the meaning of this word far beyond any dictionary definition. According to my copy of the Oxford Dictionary, a racist is a person who believes that human abilities are determined by race, a definition with which, I imagine, few

Nationalists would quarrel. It does seem, however, that this definition has been greatly extended to mean someone who hates Blacks. The tone of shocked horror in which the word 'racist' was mentioned throughout the programme was amusing in a way. It was all designed, of course, to show up anyone

H.S.HALL examines the latest in smear techniques

holding white Nationalist opinions in the worst possible light. Michael Cockerell, the interviewer and commentator throughout the programme was peculiarly well-fitted to do this; his whole manner, bearing, tone of voice and questions were all contrived to this end.

Looking back at the programme, one can see that the *Panorama* evidence was pretty flimsy—unfortunately. All Nationalists know full well that the Conservative Party is as much an internationalist, multi-racialist one as the Labour Party and the British people have nothing to hope for from either of these parties, notwithstanding what *Panorama* may say. Touching upon this matter of right-wing extremists, isn't it odd how the meaning of words has changed since the war. Anyone holding what are now described as 'extreme right-wing' views would in pre-war days and shortly thereafter have been regarded as just an ordinary Conservative with ordinary Conservative opinions. The whole political spectrum has shifted to the left so that what was once called 'right-wing' is now called and thought of as 'extreme right-wing'.

TENDENTIOUS

However, to get back to the *Panorama* programme, its tendentious nature was perfectly illustrated on several occasions. For instance, in the interview with historian, David Irving, who doesn't believe that when writing history it is sufficient merely to repeat in different words what previous historians have said, but that it is necessary to form one's own opinions on the evidence

unearthed, we were told in the introduction to the interview that David Irving had chosen as a school prize a copy of *Mein Kampf*. *Panorama* was careful not to point any moral directly but, taken in the context of the interview as a whole, it was clear that the viewer was intended to draw the conclusion "Oh! What a nasty man he must be!" Of course the real reason why Irving chose that particular book was simply that he wanted to know more about Hitler (perhaps even as a schoolboy he had visions of becoming a historian) and was not going to be put off by all the propaganda about Hitler. It is absolutely certain that A.J.P. Taylor, Colin Cross, Alan Bullock, Trevor Roper, Joachim Fest, Karl Bracher and all the other historians who have written about Hitler have read *Mein Kampf*. Are we to draw the conclusion in these cases that *Panorama* so obviously wanted us to draw in the case of David Irving: that all these historians are also admirers of Hitler and the Nazis? Anyone who wishes to understand modern history must read *Mein Kampf*, whatever he might think about Hitler and his policies.

The programme was supposed to be about the infiltration of the Conservative Party by 'right-wing extremists'. At his interview, Irving said he belonged to the radical right, was not a member of the Conservative Party and certainly did not intend to infiltrate this party since this would be a waste of time anyway because the Conservative house was rotting away! Why then did *Panorama* interview him? Irving said there were intelligent men on the right of the Conservative Party whom he was willing to help. Several MPs were mentioned in this connection but these flatly denied they had received any help and had merely met Irving on some social occasions. Was this probing another way of suggesting guilt by association?

During this attempt to connect Irving and the Conservative Party we were told that six MPs made frequent visits to Irving's apartment in Mayfair. This would indicate that *Panorama* or its agents had kept a pretty close watch on Irving's flat. Who says we don't have a 'Gestapo' in this country and a non-governmental one at that? It's a fine thing, isn't it, when a well known man is spied upon to see the company he keeps by an organisation like *Panorama*. Compare this action with the high-flown airs with which

Contd. on next page

the BBC likes to credit itself.

There were several examples of the lack of probity displayed by *Panorama*. While filming a meeting organised by WISE (a Nationalist, patriotic organisation naturally fiercely resented by *Panorama*) the commentator spoke about "numerous camera-shy members of the National Front". The picture accompanying this remark showed three young men, one turning away from the camera (whether because of the camera's presence or not it was impossible to say). It would also be interesting to learn how *Panorama* knew that these men were members of the National Front; there was nothing in the photograph to tell us. Was *Panorama* just guessing?

At this same meeting, according to the *Panorama* commentator, there were numerous National Front skinheads. Surprisingly enough we weren't shown any pictures of these. I say surprisingly because, on every other occasion in the programme whenever any person or thing was mentioned, up popped the relevant picture on the screen.

DUBIOUS METHODS

Panorama must make use of some pretty dubious methods to obtain its material. When discussing Tory Action, a very 'sinister' group according to *Panorama*, we were told that this group issues a monthly report on its activities. These were supposed to be confidential but *Panorama* blandly stated it had in its possession every copy ever issued. I wonder how it obtained these? It is pretty certain it did not come by them legitimately because I can hardly conceive Tory Action or any other right-wing group handing over such documents to a repellent body such as *Panorama*.

We were also told during the programme that the membership records of the National Front were in *Panorama's* possession. I can hardly imagine National Front HQ just handing these records over to *Panorama*, so again we are left wondering by what devious methods these records were obtained.

One of the most fatuous items in the whole programme was the attempt to make one of the unfortunate MPs who were the subject of attack to take responsibility for the actions of his mother! The man's mother, according to *Panorama*, had been a member of the National Front for several years, a fact disputed by the MP concerned (it was in connection with this item that *Panorama* admitted they possessed the membership records of the NF). We have all heard about the sins of the father being visited upon the children, but here is a case where *Panorama* thinks those of the mother should be as well;

**DAVID
IRVING
Included
for smear
treatment**



Panorama implying that membership of a Nationalist organisation is a sin. How more ridiculous can you get? Can anybody take *Panorama* seriously after this?

But this was not the only absurd thing. In the case of another of the MPs mentioned, the investigations went back to 1972—yes, 1972! As a student, one MP had attended the Youth Leader's Congress of the Italian Fascist Party and had delivered fraternal greetings in Italian. Bear in mind that the MP was a student at the time and when young we all do things we might regret in later life, and also bear in mind that this took place twelve years ago. (Truly *Panorama* delves deeply to discover dirt.) The MP explained that at the time he was a student, light-hearted, carefree and had merely taken the opportunity of having a week in Italy at someone else's expense; he had had little knowledge of what the Congress had been about. A perfectly reasonable explanation but *Panorama* wanted the viewer to see this as a very sinister event!

The BBC are always complaining they are hard up. I wonder how much this programme cost to produce with all its detailed, ancient investigations, surveillance, etc? A pretty large sum, I imagine. Was this expenditure justified?

SINISTER

It would not perhaps be an exaggeration to say that some of *Panorama's* actions had a sinister intent. G.K. Young, Leader of Tory Action, refused to be interviewed and *Panorama* had the gall to let us hear an extract from the relevant telephone conversation, with Michael Cockerell, the investigative

journalist, attempting to inveigle Mr Young with smooth, weasel words to speak on the programme. At this point the camera zoomed onto the block of flats where Mr Young lived with the name of the block conveniently and clearly defined on the screen, just in case anyone not appreciative of Mr Young's views should know where to call on him!

Thinking about this programme, with its innuendoes, half truths, distortions, statements taken out of context but with care to steer just within the laws of slander and libel, is there not a case for restricting the freedom of television to make such programmes? Nationalist parties have been the particular victims of these smear operations. Anyone or any organisation attacked in this way is quite unable to answer back if the programme producer declines to permit them the opportunity, and the only recourse is to make a complaint to the Programmes Complaints Commission. Even if this is upheld—and the chances of this seem to be very slender where Nationalist movements are concerned, if past experience is any guide—the only result is a paragraph in the *Radio Times* (which few people bother to read, I expect) detailing the unfair treatment. A case can certainly be made to curtail the freedom of producers to make these sorts of programmes, although this would give rise to hysterical screams about 'freedom'. But is it really freedom for a large, wealthy, immensely powerful body to attack organisations and individuals with few, if any, chances for the latter to answer back?

The whole concept of Press and Television freedom needs to be reviewed because it is evident that in recent years this freedom has degenerated into irresponsible licence.

ULSTER: WHAT A 'POLITICAL SOLUTION' REALLY MEANS

NORTHERN IRELAND: military or political solution? One would think from all that has been said recently that this was the great debate! Of course, it is no debate at all, despite the posture of those who have shouted the loudest for the latter. Everyone knows that a political solution is the only thing that will permanently work. No special wisdom is to be attributed to those who are always saying so. What is the issue is simply this: what do we mean when we talk of a political solution? It is many things to many people. Those who clamour for it have got to define their terms.

When terms start to be defined the point comes where so many people claiming to represent 'moderate' opinion reveal the fatuity of their thinking, for the 'moderate' — as the expression is usually understood today: liberal, rationalistic and non-partisan — has the habit of approaching every great conflict as if it is something that can be smoothed out around a table given the patience and reasonableness of all parties. This view always presupposes something which very rarely exists: that each party wants the same thing in the end. Certainly, when this is the case the round table approach is the thing to be recommended. But when the conflicting parties quite clearly want different things in the end — when they stand for objectives that represent obviously polar opposites, round table discussion is simply an exercise in futility. Therefore 'political solution', if it is to be applied, will be meaningless except as the expression of the will of the victor in the conflict.

Applying this principle to Northern Ireland, so long as the conflict involves no more than a just distribution of political rights between all sections of a community of the United Kingdom, then it is possible to talk of settlement by negotiation without bringing in the sanction of force. It is possible, in other words, to talk about a 'political solution' in the full sense in which the term is invariably used. It is possible because both sides want the same thing in the end.

REAL SITUATION

This, however, is not the real situation in Northern Ireland. More power for the Catholic community is not being sought in the service just of 'equal rights', 'justice', 'democracy' or any other such concept; it is being sought as a means of weakening the whole foundation of Unionism, which

RECENT OUTRAGE

Remains of the Durham Inn, in Belfast's Lower Falls area. One woman was killed and 19 other people injured.



is the British status of Northern Ireland. Those who resist these demands do so for one paramount reason: they want Northern Ireland to remain a part of the United Kingdom. Those who make the demands do so equally for one paramount reason: they want Northern Ireland to leave the United Kingdom and join the Irish Republic.

So long as Unionism retains the vital reigns of power, the British status of Northern Ireland is not threatened; immediately Unionism starts to relinquish some of its power the road to Republicanism is open.

Typically, our mass media have sought to confuse the issue by depicting it as a conflict between Protestants and Catholics, and postulating the (on the face of it) not unreasonable demand that political rights should not be given discriminately on a basis of religion. This has suited Republican agitators down to the ground. As people working for the detachment of Northern Ireland from Britain and its incorporation in a foreign state, they can be seen for what they are: criminal subversives with whom there can be no bargaining whatsoever, servants of treason in no different way to the Quislings of the last war. But as people simply campaigning for justice on the part of a religious group they can adopt a posture surrounded with the utmost respectability and invite sympathy

from millions of woolly people all over the British Isles!

The policy of the British Government so far seems to have assumed the latter and treated with the so-called 'Catholic' side on that basis. But in fact it is the former that is much closer to the truth.

SIMPLE QUESTION

If this is recognised, then a very simple question arises which we must all answer: how can the Government in Stormont be expected to give more power to the 'Catholic' community in Northern Ireland if it is quite clear that that power is going to be used to weaken the foundations of Northern Ireland's membership of the United Kingdom? Does any state, while sanity rules in its councils, give power to those who seek to destroy it?

This question is the one that we must consider first of all the moment that we start talking about a 'political solution'. What political solution? A political solution that compromises the unity of Great Britain? A country that agrees to such a solution can only be described as a country dominated by the death-wish. Yet almost every prescription that has been offered so far visualises nothing other than this.

What then is the right political solution? The right political solution can only

be one that reconciles the 'Catholic' community in Northern Ireland within the unbroken framework of the United Kingdom. This means that if that community is to be given power in the province proportionate to its numbers it must be ensured that that power will not be used to compromise Northern Ireland's position as a part of Great Britain.

This is a long term and not a short term task.

We on this journal, and as supporters of the National Front, being ourselves powerfully influenced by the force of nationalism, would be wrong to condemn nationalism when it provides the motive spirit for the actions of others. Irishmen who fight the status-quo in Ulster are acting rightly according to their own conscience so long as their loyalty is to **Irish nationalism**.

And if, after centuries of British involvement in Ireland — and indeed Irish involvement in Britain! — a substantial number of Irishmen and women are moved by a nationalism that excludes, and is antagonistic to, Britain, we have primarily our own selves to blame.

I was struck by this feeling particularly when some little time ago I read the report of a speech by Terence O'Neill, the then Prime Minister of Northern Ireland, given over television to the people of the province. O'Neill made a pitiful attempt to appeal to the Republican element among the population by talking of the better standard of living Irish people enjoyed as members of the United Kingdom. I thought at the time what a feeble understanding this showed of the real motives that inspire men to action and sacrifice. Dear Mr. O'Neill, in the manner typical of the modern breed of British politician, could not see why the flames of national feeling should prove a more potent shaper of people's loyalties than the promptings of the gut! Was his call not faintly symbolic of the mentality that has governed our policy in Ireland. We have tried to fight the forces of the spirit without in the slightest way summoning any counter-spirit. We should know from history in general, and Irish history in particular, that this is never the way to win.

If we are to ultimately win the battle in Northern Ireland we must offer to the Catholic community a counter-spirit more powerful in its appeal than Irish nationalism. This will not be done by the offer of greater material benefit or by unctious appeals on behalf of law, order and peace; **it can only be done through the force of British nationalism.**

And this must start in the schools.

No-one should be surprised at the state of affairs in Northern Ireland today who has troubled to find out something of the atmosphere in which Catholic children are taught in the classrooms. The teachers are usually priests, and almost from the time the young tot first sits at his desk

they imbue him with a hatred of the British flag, the British Crown and British history. Britain is depicted as a 'foreign' country in occupation of Irish soil, and every Irish Republican bandit and assassin is presented as a folk hero whose example all good Catholic children should aspire to grow up to follow. And, unbelievably, the leadership of Britain is so weak-willed that it tolerates this sedition under the guise of 'education' in schools within the United Kingdom without a whimper of protest, let alone firm action that would put an end to the business.

BRITISH PATRIOTISM

There is a very strong case for insisting that British patriotism and a proper sense of the obligations of British citizenship should be a compulsory item on the agenda of all educational establishments anywhere in the United Kingdom; and there is an especially strong case for insisting that it be such an item in educational establishments, of whatever denomination, in Northern Ireland.

If, on the other hand, we continue to tolerate the rearing of limitless new generations of people in Northern Ireland who have learnt from the cradle that the Irish Republic is their fatherland and Britain a foreign occupying power, we cannot expect otherwise but to have trouble on our hands there for another hundred, two hundred and three hundred years. Nor can we blame people in Northern Ireland for taking extreme action in the service of the 'nation' which they have been conditioned to regard as their own. What

is wrong is the concept of what this nation is, not the action on behalf of it.

So we come back to the question of our political solution.

The ultimate political solution must be to reconcile the whole of the population in Northern Ireland to membership of Britain. Until that is done we cannot talk about a 'fairer franchise', 'equal civil rights', or any other of the familiar clichés of the moment.

And we will not reconcile the whole of the population to membership of Britain until we tackle the antagonism towards Britain at its source, which is the anti-British indoctrination of the very young, and until we offer the young a national idea with the force to overcome the appeal of Irish Republicanism.

Until this task is undertaken, all talk about a 'political solution' to the Ulster troubles is nothing more than mere rhetoric.

*This article was first published in
SPEARHEAD in October 1971*

PUBLISHING DELAY

ONCE AGAIN we must apologise to our readers for a delay in publication which has resulted in our magazine appearing late in the month. On this occasion copy was prepared well in advance but we suffered a hold up due to illness on the part of our usual typesetter. This and another factor outside our control have frustrated our intentions. We hope for earlier appearance in April.

How to obtain SPEARHEAD

Spearhead is available from our office to those who wish to ensure obtaining copies for themselves every month and to those who wish to obtain quantities for redistribution.

Those wishing for copies for themselves each month should take out a subscription by filling in the form below and sending it to us with a cheque or postal order for the amount applicable.

NAME

ADDRESS

The following rates are for 12 issues (please tick in box where applicable):—


British Isles: £8.00 ☐ Overseas unsealed surface mail: £8.55 ☐ Overseas sealed surface mail: £10.60 ☐
Unsealed air-mail Middle East: £11.50 ☐ Unsealed air-mail Canada, USA, South America and
Africa: £13.10 ☐ Unsealed air-mail Australia, New Zealand, Far East: £14.00 ☐

Please note: These overseas rates apply if remittance is in Pounds Sterling; if remittance is in overseas currency, an additional charge of £3 is required in the case of cheques and 50p in the case of banknotes, these going to pay banker's commission.

Discounts for bulk purchases can be obtained as follows:—

10-19 copies: 40p ea.; 20-49 copies: 36p ea.; 50-99 copies: 30p ea.; 100-199 copies: 26p ea.; 200-400 copies: 22p ea.; 500 copies or over: 20p ea. (For advice on postal rates, please contact our office).

All cheques or postal orders should be made out to *Spearhead* and sent to: Seacroft, Westbourne Villas, Hove, Sussex.



SIR: I refer to the January 1984 issue of *Spearhead* and would like to clarify some figures contained in the article 'The Common Market After Athens, Time for a British UDI'. The article reads . . . "In the case of West Germany, her contributions are more than balanced by a huge trading surplus with the community, which currently comes to £5,130,000 . . . No such advantage, on the other hand accrues to Britain, whose trade with the EEC runs at a net loss of £1,140,000 at the last reckoning."

The question that I would like to ask is: does the figure '£5,130,000' mean 5 million 130 thousand pounds or does it mean £5 billion and 130 million? Likewise in respect of Britain's net loss, does the figure shown stand for £1 million and 140 thousand pounds or is it intended to mean £1 billion plus 140 million? In short, have 3 000s been left off the figures?

NAME & ADDRESS SUPPLIED
Australia

Editor's note: We are grateful to the writer of this letter for drawing our attention to a typographical error. The figures for the German surplus should have been £5,130 million and the British deficit £1,140 million.

SIR: The announcement that Mrs. Thatcher led a government delegation that included Sir Geoffrey Howe and Defence Secretary Michael Heseltine to Russia for the funeral of the late Yuri Andropov is indicative of the snivelling attitude of today's Western Governments towards the Godless creed of Communism.

What should be justification for a national celebration (in Britain at least) is treated more in keeping with the announcement that some terrible catastrophe has befallen the British people, with our national press devoting page after page of its publications to the little known life of Andropov, almost hourly radio news bulletins detailing the step-by-step preparations taking place in Red Square and a high powered delegation led by Vice President Bush arriving in our country to brief Mrs. Thatcher prior to her departure.

Just to ensure that no one from the Westminster funny farm is left out, Labour's own Dennis Healey flew to the funeral followed by David Owen for the SDP and David Steel for the Liberals.

All in all, it really is a collection of the politically dead paying tribute to the physically dead!

TERRY FITZGERALD,
London S.E.2

SIR: The attack on you in *Nationalism Today* took me back to my long-vanished youth. In the high school that I attended in California, one way of wasting the taxpayers' money and the youngsters' time was the publication of a weekly newspaper, for which smug little dunderheads wrote "satire" of precisely that kind. I could only marvel at their ability to think themselves clever. Could they have been reincarnated in England?

(Professor) REVILO P. OLIVER,
Urbana, Ill., U.S.A.

SIR: If Messrs. Pearce and Griffin and the rest of the National Front Directorate had removed the deadly cancer of Webster 4 years ago, the NF would not now be the sick organisation they say it is.

The best thing Pearce and Griffin could do is tell all the members and supporters of the NF to join the British National Party. Why don't they?

PAUL FERN,
Burton-on-Trent, Staffs.

SIR: I see that the BBC has done a real hatchet job on my old professor, Sir Cyril Burt, who died in 1971 (BBC2 *Horizon*, 9.30 p.m., 9th January).

I have nothing but contempt for these aliens and their paid stooges. Why did they wait until Professor Burt was dead before putting out this mendacious propaganda? Because Sir Cyril Burt had proved that intelligence is inherited both individually and racially. The acceptance of these findings stood in the way of the International Khazar Jews and their Marxist theory of the importance of the environment in the creation of intelligence. Sir Cyril Burt's name had to be blackened since his findings opposed the propaganda contrived by the international conspirators who wish to destroy the white race by miscegenation. They aim to control a world of industrial and agricultural slaves, and an intelligent race such as the North Western Europeans stand in the way of their attainment of this objective. Using their control of world finance, they aim to cajole, entice and if necessary drive the white race to integrate with Negroes and Asiatics.

(Capt.) K. R. McKILLIAM,
Lympe, Kent

SIR: Your contributor Charles Brooks' thoughtful article (January issue) was marred by an egregious error of fact.

HMS Hampshire did not sink with all hands, as Mr. Brooks stated. Over 20 of the

crew survived. Also, despite the doubt implied by his use of inverted commas, there is no doubt that she did strike a mine. Several had been laid in the area by U73 in the previous few days. Whether the authorities knew they were there is, of course, another matter.

W. R. HEELER,
Farrer, A.C.T., Australia

SIR: This country has just received another high rise in unemployment, which no one in power seems able to stem.

Surely the obvious solution is to ban all imports of commodities that can be manufactured or produced in this country by our own people. Whatever you buy now - from hand-tools and electrical goods through to motor vehicles and farm machinery is foreign.

Also why import potatoes, carrots, milk and other farm produce of which this country can produce sufficient for our needs? The only way that I see of ever achieving this goal is with a Nationalist Government that puts Britain first.

G. A. ROLPH,
Brandon, Suffolk

SIR: On the 8th February 1984 Dublin's Supreme Court, the Irish Republic's final legal authority, rejected plans to give Irish voting rights to Britons living in Eire. A wise decision on their part, and one which we, the BNP, should strive to equal. However, this anomaly is just another symptom of the democratic disease. The movement which provides the remedy for 'democracy' will be the movement that pulls Britain from the avoidable path to oblivion. Let it be us.

ERIC BRAND,
Glasgow G3

SIR: In reply to Miss Darrell-Smith's letter last month, I hope that the door to unity with the National Front is opening now that the main obstacle, Martin Webster, has been removed.

Many of us now in the BNP helped over the years to build up and establish the NF.

Spearhead since its days of supporting the New National Front has called for Nationalist unity. I hope that this policy will not change.

Regardless of people's personal views, there is just not room enough for more than one Nationalist party in Britain, so to those other small parties I say: it is time to come home, to make one big, strong party and with strong leadership (something the BNP has over everyone else) to make a movement which will again have the traitorous establishment really worried.

B. J. OSBORNE
London E.2

SIR: I am really touched to hear that Prince Charles is 'concerned' about the increasing vicious attacks on old people. Coming from someone who has done so much to encourage multi-racialism this is humbug indeed.

PENSIONER
London S.E.1

For the first time in my life I take up my pen to write something political. I have always believed that teachers should be above politics and that politics is not an area for the likes of me—brought up by 'establishment' parents, with a university education at a reasonably conservative institution (by today's standards anyway). Politics of the extreme left or right were, I thought, for the fanatics who believe that ideas are more important than people. Well, I still believe that that is true of the left; but I understand now that the so-called 'extreme' right is concerned with creating a healthy society and environment so that one can walk the streets in safety and educate children culturally so that their school-life is free of the tainting brush of politics. It is about this that I write.

I am a teacher of six years' standing in a 'good' comprehensive school in a fairly rural situation. An ideal environment in which to instil children with the faculties of wonder and awe. As an English teacher I have always tried to do this—with cultural literature and British folk tales. I am given a fairly free rein with my first year class. The rot begins in the third, in which the choice of material (stipulated by the English Department of the school) centres around a presentation of the life-style of gypsies, and 'proves' that they are misunderstood victims of a capitalistic system. The gypsies try to play the game our way (out of the kindness of their hearts, of course) by dealing in scrap metal. Passages of 'literature' are explored which show the so-called 'superiority' of the gypsy's morality above ours. They are depicted as a much maligned race, like the Jews. I have refused to teach this material, claiming that I will not make English into sociology (that most dubious of 'ologies'). My reasons for refusal are, of course, more extreme than that.

However, the spur which led to to write this present article is a batch of recent mock examination scripts from my 16-year-olds. The titles were the brainchild of our liberal (CND supporting, of course) Head of Department. 16-year old children were asked to debate "abortion on demand", the "abolition of monarchy", "that missiles and nuclear bases be forbidden on British soil"—I am afraid the list goes on. And I have read the pathetic replies to these most open-ended of questions.

They are full of left-wing, cliché-ridden twaddle, with not an original

SUBVERSION IN THE SCHOOLS

A teacher, who must remain anonymous, reports from the inside

thought amongst them—which of course is exactly the idea. Here is a typical example: "Immigrants are employed in poorly paid jobs and discriminated against dissatisfaction in living in these areas results in their anger being expressed in violence, such as the Toxteth riots ... The obvious need is for financial resources to develop a multi-ethnic society."

PROPAGANDA TOOL

Of course, the person responsible for this indoctrination is nice enough—she, the Head of the English Department, is just one of thousands of instruments, useful for the cause, knowingly or unknowingly. And what cause is that? Why, the achievement of the most caring-sharing society on earth—the sort they have in the Soviet Union, in which the individual works for the glory only of the State. He voluntarily and nobly gives up his right to say what he wants done with the education of his children. He knows that the Communist State knows best, and just in case he ever forgets this self-evident fact and broadcasts heretical views, then the State in its kindness removes him to another seat of learning—a rest home in Siberia.

Is the situation so very different here? All right, we don't get sent to Siberia (yet)—but there is Coventry, and that's a start. How much do we now have a say in the education of our children? And I speak as a teacher—I know the reaction when I remonstrate at our English departmental meeting. There will be hushed awkwardness. "What do you mean?" the products

of university education will say, "It's good for young people to question values."

"Why?" I will ask. "They are only children. What do, or should young children know of the murky evils of this world? How can we ask them to consider the pros and cons of abortion, for example? All that will do is make an issue into an idea divorced from any kind of reality."

Then, of course, there is the moral angle. The question assumes that it is perfectly acceptable to discuss abortion in the first place. What do young children know? The conversation at school meetings usually goes something like this:

"Just because you are against it"

"That's nothing to do with it. For me it is not an issue. We are creating in children's minds ideas that they cannot possibly be mature enough to assimilate. It will forever taint the way they see it."

Silence, or: "You're just old-fashioned, a bigot." Sometimes: "You must realise that this is the way it's done these days."

I do realise that, as I do my weekly duty round the school buildings, read the filthy graffiti, hear the obscene language and see the many faces of blank contempt and disillusionment. Yet it is not exactly as the left would have it—society does let down its youth (its future) but it is precisely through this liberality and 'open-mindedness' that it does it, not because (as the left would have us believe) of its harshness. Anything today is fit for discussion in schools: anarchy, drug-abuse, homosexuality. But anything as old-fashioned and healthy as self-respect and the individual taking responsibility for his own actions is greeted with a knowing, condescending grin. "You mean people still think you can discuss things like that?! No! No! This is the age of the trained personal analyst. If you know why something is done you surely cannot blame the person doing it?"

This, of course, is the crux of it. It's all right to discuss anything as long as you don't judge it morally. Morality is dying. I see this every day in my school. The Soviets get closer every day. It will not need a nuclear war or an invasion. The idea gains its stranglehold over the minds of its morally helpless victims—a much more complete victory. Big Brother is indeed watching us all. 1984 is here.

So unless we can prevent the minds of our children from being tainted with the communist brush, our civilisation is doomed.

GREAT SOCIAL IN LONDON

THE LONDON SOCIAL staged by the British National Party on the 2nd March was by common consent by far the best event of its kind ever.

A convivial atmosphere was maintained by the presence of Archie Wilson and his four-piece band, which played popular melodies for singing and dancing refreshingly free of the degenerate and alien influences in the music played at some Nationalist social functions. Thrown in also were a comedian and some competitions, together with plenty of good food (laid on by Sylvia May) and drink, and a good time was had by all.

About 120 attended — a fair number considering they were almost exclusively from London and nearby and had to pay £5

a head. When the word gets round, however, of what a good social it was we expect a better attendance at the next social event, which is scheduled for late Spring. It is also hoped to obtain a more central location which will be more convenient to those coming from South of the Thames.

Congratulations must go to Robin May, who undertook responsibility for organising and promoting the social, which he did supremely well.

Another London social has now been booked for Saturday May 5th. More details later.

St. George's Day draw

LEEDS BRANCH of the British National Party is running a St. George's Day draw which we hope party members and branches all over the country will support. 1st prize is £50, 2nd prize £25 and 3rd prize £10. Various other prizes will be given.

Tickets cost 10p each. BNP branches ordering in quantities will be given a discount of 20 per-cent. Orders should be sent with cash (including provision for postage) to: British National Party, PO Box BR10, Bramley, Leeds 13.

BNP Recordings

RALLY '82

Speeches from the BNP national rally in London on October 16th 1982, the theme of which was 'Unite and fight for Britain's future!'

Side 1: Speeches by Charles Parker and Ray Hill; Side 2: Speech by John Tyndall.

VOICES OF NATIONALISM

Side 1: Recordings of speeches from the Nationalist Unity rally in London on September 5th 1981. Hear John Tyndall, Ray Hill, Kenneth McKilliam, Len Bearsford Walker and others. Side 2: Talk by John Tyndall on 'The coming British revolution'.

TYNDALL SPEAKS I

Side 1: Talk on 'Our Anglo-Saxon heritage' (about the world-wide dispersal of the peoples of British stock); Side 2: Talk on 'Britain's economic crisis'.

TYNDALL SPEAKS II

Side 1: Talk on 'The case for Nationalism' (the internationalist argument demolished); Side 2: Talk on 'Tragedy of the 20th Century' (analysis of the results of the Second World War).

These 4 sets of recordings are presented in cassette form and are available at £3.50 each (with 17p postage) from: BNP Recordings, Box 115, Hove, E. Sussex BN3 3SB.



HAVING A GOOD TIME
One of the scenes at the party

BNP scares reds in Loughborough

BRITISH NATIONAL PARTY newspaper sellers in Loughborough, Leics., were prevented from operating in the town centre on Saturday, the 18th February, by order of the police, who claimed that they had received complaints alleging that the sellers had made 'racist comments' to passers by.

There can be no doubt that the police concerned were acting on orders from politically motivated authorities. Sales teams from the Communist Party and Socialist Workers' Party have been operating in the same area for a long time and have had no such harassment. There was not a shred of evidence that the BNP paper sellers uttered the 'racist comments' that they were alleged to have done, and indeed all BNP activists are instructed to desist from such behaviour. All that the police had to go on was the word of those who quite obviously are the BNP's opponents.

The police warned that "words likely to

cause a breach of the peace" might have been used and an offence might have been committed. So now we have reached a point at which perfectly lawful political activists in this 'free democracy' are stopped because of something that was not witnessed or proved to have happened but merely might have happened!

Loughborough BNP are anyway undismayed but treat this aggravation as a sign that their activities in the town have got someone seriously worried. Recently student member Jim McGeown got the party 3 continuous days of local media coverage over a Leicestershire County Council withdrawal of a meeting hall booking made by Loughborough BNP. When Jim started to sell *British Nationalist* in the Charnwood Precinct there was only one left-wing paper seller in the vicinity but as the weeks passed by and the BNP established a regular presence the number of left-wingers increased considerably.

Bromley

BROMLEY BRANCH of the British National Party is a prime example of one of those branches in which limited numbers of members have maintained a high output of activity.

Bromley Borough is situated in the far South Eastern corner of the Greater London area and is in fact geographically, though not in population, London's largest, incorporating the former boroughs of Bromley, Beckenham, Penge, Orpington and Chislehurst. In political terms this consists of the parliamentary constituencies of Ravensbourne, Beckenham, Orpington and Chislehurst. The branch fought all these four seats in the 1983

General Election, just as 4 years previously, when a branch of the National Front, it did so in the 1979 General Election. This is a remarkable achievement for a branch of its size and resources and a tribute to the dedication of its small team of activists, backed up by a few generous financial helpers, none of them wealthy people.

From the beginning the leading activist and catalyst in the branch has been Alf Waite, a Nationalist of exceptional dedication and resolve who has worked prodigiously to promote the party in a die-hard Conservative area mostly prosperous and resistant to change. Mr. Waite has had the admirable backing of his wife Eileen, who has displayed remarkable tolerance at the conversion of a large part of the Waite household into an ongoing campaign headquarters.

One of the functions in which Alf Waite has especially excelled is the upkeep of a regular round of personal calls on the homes of all known local Nationalists, not all of them BNP members. These regular calls have enabled the branch to maintain a high volume of sales of party literature and have been very useful in keeping donations flowing in. We know of no other branch, except possibly Enfield, where this function of personal calls is kept up with the same diligence and regularity.

After the divisions in the Nationalist movement in 1979/80 a number of previous active helpers dropped out in discouragement and forced Mr. Waite to rebuild the branch



PAPER SALE IN ORPINGTON

almost from scratch. A lesser man would have given up in despair but Alf Waite persevered, often working almost on his own. Gradually he gathered around him a new team of activists, mostly young, of whom the outstanding ones are Brian Phillips, Andrew Shotton and Russell Husband. The young activists of the branch have, under Mr. Waite's supervision, produced an excellent little branch magazine, *Counter Attack*, which has won popularity in the party far beyond Bromley.

Alf Waite, in addition to his tireless work in his own area, has also assisted the party in the organisation of larger national functions, to which he has always attended with the dedication and efficiency that is typical of him.

Those wishing to make contact with Bromley BNP should write to Mr. Waite at PO Box 457, London SE20 7QE.



ALF WAITE

British Nationalist

You can obtain single copies of *British Nationalist* by paying a subscription of £3.40 for 12 issues (for subscribers in the British Isles). For subscribers overseas the rate is £4.00 for 12 issues (surface mail).

If you wish to obtain *British Nationalist* in bulk for redistribution, the rates are:—

10 copies	£1.20	+ 32p post
25 copies	£2.70	+ 94p post
50 copies	£4.80	+ £1.57 post
100 copies	£8.40	+ £1.90 post
150 copies	£12.00	+ £2.10 post
200 copies	£15.00	+ £2.25 post
300 copies	£21.00	+ £2.55 post
400 copies	£26.40	+ £2.80 post
500 copies	£32.00) Bulk rates
1,000 copies	£62.00) by roadline

All cheques or postal orders should be made out to *British Nationalist*, PO Box 446, London SE23 2LS. Please keep orders and enquiries for *British Nationalist* totally separate from other correspondence in order to avoid delay and confusion.

PLEASE DONATE!

BECAUSE we of *Spearhead* speak our mind openly on the great issues of the day, without fear of what powerful interests we offend, our magazine is constantly short of money. We cannot persuade the large wholesale distributors to buy copies, and our income from advertising is tiny. We obtain distribution through postal subscriptions and by sales through the local branches of the British National Party, which we support. The revenue from these sources is nowhere near enough to enable us to meet our production costs at the present time.

This is why we urgently need regular donations from our readers and supporters — over and on top of what they pay for their copies. We hope that you will become one of these regular donors. Please send us what you can so that we can continue publishing our vital message.

We remind all those making donations that it is not our custom to send receipts automatically except for sums of £10 or over. This is in order to cut down on office work and postage. If, however, any donor of less than £10 should desire confirmation of receipt, would they please enclose an S.A.E. with their donation.

All contributions should be sent to *Spearhead*, 52 Westbourne Villas, Hove, Sussex.

LAW AS A SERVANT OF POLITICS

(Contd. from page 8)

needs reinforcement: the British Nationality Act must be rewritten and re-enacted upon the basis of the Nationalist Folk-concept; the Defamation Act of 1952; the Incitement to Disaffection Act of 1934 and the Mental Health Act of 1959 and sundry other Acts must be strengthened in the National interest and, when necessary, invoked as instruments in our campaign of National regeneration.

Free access to the Law should be available equitably to all British citizens who give allegiance to the Nationalist State. The Law should protect the young from the corruption and exploitation of pornographers, deviants and films, broadcasts and publications which condition the young in anti-social behaviour and violence. The emphasis will be placed upon the projection of the noble and good example which will lead to the observance of the Law and the motivation to serve the Folk-Community.

Our opponents will, no doubt, level the charge that we are indulging in "social engineering"

or enacting "political law", but all law deals with the state of society and the defence of rights and restitution in terms of wrongs and therefore, all law is political. The real difference between "democratic law" and Nationalist law is in perception and ultimate objectives. Nationalist law is not limited to private or legislative considerations, but has a wider vision of the National good and the improvement of the State and Race.

LEGAL REQUIREMENTS OF NATIONALIST STATE

A Nationalist state should observe the basic, historical legal precepts which are incorporated within our present Constitution, namely:—

(a) The absolute supremacy and predominance of regular law and the exclusion of arbitrary power except in a state of national emergency (arbitrary power is the power exercised, in historical terms, in the Star Chamber of Tudor and Stuart times, which was held in private and which could punish men for crimes which were never disclosed, on evidence that was never published).

(b) Equality before the Law, or the equal sub-

jection of all classes to the ordinary Law of the land administered by the ordinary courts of law.

These historical precepts might have to be modified, at times, to allow for the needs of contemporary situations, but they should be regarded as the basic legal principles to which we as Nationalists subscribe.

Manipulative law, that first refuge of the scoundrel, would cease to exist and the clever legal ploy which so often serves to defeat justice would receive scant recognition. Justice would no longer be determined by the size of one's bank account but would be the inalienable right of all citizens. Justice would be paramount, Law would be the handmaiden of Justice and Justice would be that which conformed to the objectives and principles of the Folk-State which would be the quintessence of the common good.

The Nationalist ideal is an integrated, corporate, indigenous society in which all areas of human activity merge in a unifying concept with Law as the integral, co-ordinative factor. Nationalist Law is the Spirit of the Folk-State and inspires and directs human activity and relationships to the fulfilment of the Nationalist Folk Ideal — the integrity of our race — happiness through service and self-development — and making Britain Great AGAIN.

BNP wall plaque

PLYMOUTH BRANCH of the British National Party has produced an extremely attractive piece of home decoration which should be very popular among party supporters. It is a wall plaque in wood carving, which we illustrate here. The words at top and bottom say "British National Party — for race and nation". The plaque is most attractively coloured, with Union Jacks in red, white and blue.

The plaques may be ordered from: Mr. L. Bearsford Walker, 44 Patterdale Close, Estover, Plymouth, Devon. They cost £15, incl. postage.



VOTE FOR BRITAIN

VOTE BNP

Manifesto of the British National Party

B. N. P. MEMBERS, wear your badges! Still only a small portion of the membership has bought the party badge. Price £1 each plus 25p p & p. From BNP, PO Box 457, London SE20 7QE.

Our magazine, though it believes in racial differences, opposes race-hatred. All those who oppose multi-racialism should attack the politicians who promote it, not the immigrants, who are merely its victims.



National Review

The League Review, a pro-National Socialist political journal published in Great Britain by the League of St. George.

£5 for 6 issues, British Isles and overseas surface mail (US \$12)

9/11 KENSINGTON HIGH ST.
LONDON. W8 5NP

THE THUNDERBOLT: A hard hitting monthly paper for American and other white race patriots. Independent of any political party. Sample copy for 90p from PO Box 1211, Marietta, Ga. 30061, U. S. A.

B. N. P. ELECTION MANIFESTO for 1983, available at 43p post-free from: P. O. Box 115, Hove, E. Sussex BN3 3SB.

Find out about the British National Party

Send 20p for information pack.

To:
P.O. BOX 115
HOVE
E. SUSSEX BN3 3SB
(Tel. 0273 777540)

Name

Address

I enclose